arXiv:1610.00690v1 [math.ST] 3 Oct 2016

How the instability of ranks in non-central limit theorems affects large-sample inference under long memory

Shuyang Bai
University of Georgia

Murad S. Taqqu
Boston University

October 4, 2016

Abstract

Mathematically, under long memory, one can obtain so-called non-central limit theorems involving non-Gaussian limits. In these non-central limit theorems, a positive integer called "Hermite rank" plays a crucial role. The non-Gaussian limit appears only when the Hermite rank is greater than one. From a practical point of view, however, we argue that an Hermite rank greater than one is unstable. In contrast, an Hermite rank equal to one is stable. We provide empirical evidence supporting this argument. Assuming a higher-order Hermite rank when it is not really there will result in underestimating the order of the fluctuations of the statistic of interest. Examples are given to illustrate what happens when large-sample theories exclude higher-order Hermite ranks.

1 Introduction

Suppose that $\mathcal{D}$ is a data set, and one has a statistical model for $\mathcal{D}$ which involves a random stationary sequence $\{X(n)\}$, referred to as noise.. Let $T = T(\mathcal{D})$ be a sample statistic of interest. Deriving the asymptotic distribution for the statistic T as the sample size tends to infinity is a standard practice in large sample inference. The asymptotic distribution is useful for reporting confidence intervals, conducting hypothesis tests, etc..

When the construction of the statistic T involves summing the data and the stationary noise $\{X(n)\}$ is weakly dependent, the asymptotic distribution of T is typically Gaussian through the Central Limit Theorem (sometimes it is a functional of Gaussian process obtained by applying the Continuous Mapping Theorem).

The situation, however, is much more intricate when the strength of dependence in the noise increases to a certain level. This strong-dependence regime, often called *long memory* or *long-range dependence*, is typically characterized by the following behavior of the variance of partial sum:

$$\mathrm{Var}\left[\sum_{n=1}^{N} X(n)\right] \approx N^{2H}, \text{ as } N \to \infty. \tag{1}$$

where $\approx$ means asymptotic equivalence up to some positive constant, $H \in (1/2, 1)$ is called the *Hurst index*[1]. Normally when the dependence is weak, one expects $H = 1/2$ in (1), that is, the growth of the variance is

Key words: Long-range dependence; Long memory; Hermite rank; power rank; non-Gaussian limit; instability; large-sample inference.

2010 AMS Classification: 62M10

[1]The term "Hurst index" is also frequently used for the self-similarity parameter of self-similar processes, which can arise as the scaling limit of the sum of $X(n)$ (see Embrechts and Maejima [34]). It is also common to introduce the so-called memory parameter d, using which (2) is re-expressed as $\mathrm{Cov}[X(n), X(0)] \approx n^{2d-1}$ ($d = H - 1/2$). We will use H throughout in order to avoid the confusion arising from switching between various parameters.

linear. The superlinear growth in (1) is typically due to the slow decay of the covariance of $\{X(n)\}$:

$$\mathrm{Cov}[X(n), X(0)] \approx n^{2H-2}, \text{ as } n \to \infty, \tag{2}$$

where $-1 < 2H - 2 < 0$. In fact, (2) is also a common characterization of long memory. We refer the reader to Beran et al. [13], Giraitis et al. [38] and Pipiras and Taqqu [63] for a comprehensive introduction to the notion long memory.

In view of (1), when deriving the asymptotic distribution, one needs to associate the stronger normalization N^{-H} to $\sum_{n=1}^{N} X(n)$ rather than the standard $N^{-1/2}$ normalization. One might hope that asymptotic normality still holds after this change in normalization. This is indeed the case when $\{X(n)\}$ is a Gaussian process, or more generally, a linear (moving-average) process. However, one can in theory obtain other non-Gaussian limits as well. For example, when $\{X(n)\}$ is a nonlinear transform of a long-memory Gaussian process, one can get limits expressed by *multiple Wiener-Itô integrals* (Itô [49]). See, e.g., Dobrushin [30] and Taqqu [73]. This type of non-Gaussian convergence results are often called *non-central limit theorems*. These results can be extended to nonlinear transforms of long-memory linear processes (see Surgailis [70] and Ho and Hsing [45]). These non-central limit theorems have been used in many studies to derive asymptotic distributions for statistical inference. A literature review with discussion will be given in Section 5.

This paper makes the following basic argument: the non-central limit theorems are definitely of interest, but their immediate application to statistical inference can lead to problems. This is because the convergence to a non-Gaussian limit in the non-central limit theorem is unstable. It often ceases to hold when $\{X(n)\}$ is perturbed through the inclusion of some disturbance in the model.

The non-central limit theorems involve a crucial quantity, called *Hermite rank* in the Gaussian context, which is also related to the nonlinear transformation considered. This rank, which is a positive integer, determines the asymptotic behavior of the covariance and the asymptotic distribution of the partial sum of $\{X(n)\}$. We will show, however, that any rank higher than one is very unstable, and easily collapses to rank one when there is a slight perturbation.

The rank instability in non-central limit theorems is described in Section 2 and is illustrated by empirical evidence in Section 3. In contrast, we show in Section 4 that the central limit theorems under weak dependence are usually robust against a nonlinear transform perturbation. In Section 5, we discuss some examples on how the instability of rank can affect statistical results. In Section 6, we briefly review some statistical studies for long memory data involving non-central limit theorems. Section 7 contains a conclusion and suggestions.

2 Instability of rank in noncentral limit theorems

In this section, we introduce the Hermite rank and point out its instability. The discussion focuses first on the simple scenario of instantaneous transformation of a Gaussian stationary process. We then extend the discussion to non-instantaneous transformations. We also address the case of models involving a non-Gaussian linear process, where the analogue notion of Hermite rank is the so-called *Appell rank* or *power rank*. We then provide empirical evidence of instability.

For simplicity, we shall avoid including slowly varying functions, for example, logarithmic functions (Bingham et al. [15]), and restrict ourselves to those that are asymptotically equivalent to nonzero constants. The notation $a(n) \approx b(n)$ means $c \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} a(n)/b(n) \le \limsup_{n\to\infty} a(n)/b(n) \le C$ for some $0 < c \le C < \infty$.

2.1 Instantaneous transformation

Recall that a Hermite polynomial $H_m(\cdot)$ is defined as $H_0(x) = 1$ and

$$H_m(x) = (-1)^m e^{x^2/2} \frac{d}{dx^m} e^{-x^2/2} \quad \text{for} \quad m \ge 1. \tag{3}$$

Thus $H_1(x) = x$, $H_2(x) = x^2 - 1$ and $H_3(x) = x^3 - 3x$, etc. It is well-known (see, e.g., Nourdin and Peccati [60], Proposition 1.4.2) that $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{m!}} H_m(\cdot), m \ge 0\}$ forms an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\gamma)$, where γ is the standard Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}$.

Definition 2.1. Suppose that a function $G(\cdot) \in L^2(\gamma)$. Let Z be a standard Gaussian random variable. The *Hermite rank* k of $G(\cdot)$ is defined as

$$k = \inf\left\{m \geq 1 : \ \mathbb{E}G(Z)H_m(Z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x)H_m(x)d\gamma(x) \neq 0\right\}. \tag{4}$$

where $H_m(\cdot)$ is the m-th order Hermite polynomial.

Remark 2.2. An alternative way of defining the Hermite rank k is through the starting index of the Hermite expansion of $G(\cdot) - \mathbb{E}G(Z)$, namely,

$$G(\cdot) - \mathbb{E}G(Z) = \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} c_m H_m(\cdot), \quad k \geq 1, \tag{5}$$

for some sequence c_m. Note that $H_0(x) = 1$. By the orthonormality of $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{m!}}H_m(\cdot)\}$, we have

$$c_m = \mathbb{E}[G(Z)H_m(Z)]/m! \quad \text{for} \quad m \geq 0. \tag{6}$$

Furthermore, since the Hermite polynomials $\{H_m(\cdot), 0 \leq m \leq k\}$ form a basis for polynomials of degree less than equal to k, the definition (4) can be re-expressed as

$$k = \inf\left\{m \geq 1 : \ \mathbb{E}\Big[\big(G(Z) - \mathbb{E}G(Z)\big)Z^m\Big] \neq 0\right\}. \tag{7}$$

Remark 2.3. The Hermite rank of $G(x)$ is the same as that of $G(x) + a$, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, since relation (5) involves centering.

We also state a useful lemma for computing the covariance (p.223 of Beran et al. [13]).

Lemma 2.4. *If $G(\cdot)$ has Hermite rank k, then*

$$\mathrm{Cov}[G(X(n)), G(X(0))] \approx \mathrm{Cov}[X(n), X(0)]^k \approx n^{(2H-2)k}. \tag{8}$$

Remark 2.5. Comparing (8) and (2), we note that for functions $G(\cdot)$ that have Hermite rank $k = 1$, the Hurst index of $\{G(X(n))\}$ is the same as the Hurst index of $\{X(n)\}$.

Now consider the following noise model: a standardized long-memory Gaussian stationary process $\{X(n), n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with Hurst index $H \in (1/2, 1)$, namely, $\mathrm{Cov}[X(n), X(0)] \approx n^{2H-2}$. Suppose the statistic T is such that for deriving the asymptotic distribution, one needs to study the limit distribution as $N \to \infty$ of

$$\frac{1}{A(N)} \sum_{n=1}^{[Nt]} \Big(G(X(n)) - \mathbb{E}G(X(n))\Big), \quad t \in [0, 1], \tag{9}$$

where $G(\cdot) \in L^2(\gamma)$, $A(N)$ is a suitable normalization, and $[\cdot]$ stands for the integer part.

The following non-central limit theorem holds.

Theorem 2.6. *(Dobrushin and Major [31] and Taqqu [73]) Suppose that G has Hermite rank k, and that the Hurst index H of $\{X(n)\}$ satisfies*

$$H > 1 - \frac{1}{2k}. \tag{10}$$

Then $\{G(X(n))\}$ has long memory with Hurst index:

$$H_G = (H - 1)k + 1 \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right). \tag{11}$$

Furthermore, as $N \to \infty$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N^{H_G}} \sum_{n=1}^{[Nt]} \Big(G(X(n)) - \mathbb{E}G(X(n))\Big) \Rightarrow cZ_{H_G,k}(t), \tag{12}$$

for some $c \neq 0$, where $\Rightarrow$ denotes the weak convergence in the Skorohod space $D[0,1]$ with uniform metric, and where

$$Z_{H_G,k}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^k}' \int_0^t \prod_{j=1}^k (s - x_j)_+^\gamma ds \; B(dx_1) \dots B(dx_k), \tag{13}$$

with

$$\gamma = H - \frac{3}{2} = \frac{H_G - 1}{k} - \frac{1}{2} \in \left(-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}, -\frac{1}{2} \right). \tag{14}$$

$Z_{H_G,k}(t)$ is the so-called k-th order Hermite process.

The process $Z_{H_G,k}(t)$ in (13) is defined through a k-tuple Wiener-Itô integral with respect to the standard Brownian motion $B(\cdot)$ (see, e.g., Major [56]). The prime $'$ in (13) indicates the exclusion of the diagonals $x_p = x_q$ in the multiple integral.

Remark 2.7. When the Hermite rank $k = 1$, one has

$$H_G = H$$

and the limit $Z_{H_G,k}(t)$ in Theorem 2.6 is the *fractional Brownian motion* $B_H(t)$, namely, the centered Gaussian process given by the following covariance structure:

$$\mathrm{Cov}\left[B_H(s), B_H(t)\right] = \frac{1}{2}\left(|s|^{2H} + |t|^{2H} - |s-t|^{2H}\right).$$

When the Hermite rank $k = 2$, $Z_{H_G,2}(t)$ is called the *Rosenblatt process* (see Rosenblatt [66] and Taqqu [72]).

Remark 2.8. The Hermite process $Z_{H_G,k}(t)$ in (13) admits different representations. We refer the reader to Pipiras and Taqqu [62] and Pipiras and Taqqu [63] for more details.

Remark 2.9. When condition (10) is replaced by $H < 1 - \frac{1}{2k}$, then the celebrated Breuer-Major central limit theorem (Breuer and Major [16]) (see also Theorem 4.2 below) states that the convergence (12) is replaced by a convergence of finite-dimensional distributions to Brownian motion with the standard normalization $N^{-1/2}$, so that $H_G = 1/2$. The boundary case $H = 1 - \frac{1}{2k}$ typically falls in the central limit theorem (convergence to Brownian motion) regime after modifying the normalization $N^{-1/2}$ by some slowly varying factors.

In practice, it is hard to guarantee that the noise $\{X(n)\}$ is Gaussian. A natural relaxation is as follows. Suppose that there is an underlying long-memory *Gaussian* stationary process $\{Y(n)\}$. Assume without loss of generality that $\{Y(n)\}$ is standardized. Suppose now that the noise sequence $\{X(n)\}$ in the model is generated by a filter $F(\cdot)$ as:

$$X(n) = F(Y(n), Y(n-1), \dots). \tag{15}$$

We suppose in this section that the filter F is instantaneous, namely

$$X(n) = F(Y(n)). \tag{16}$$

The case of non-instantaneous filter will be addressed in Section 2.2, but the issues remain essentially the same.

Remark 2.10. There are different ways to interpret (16). First, note that when $F(\cdot)$ is nonlinear, $X(n)$ is non-Gaussian. So $F(\cdot)$ can represent the departure from the ideal Gaussian assumption. Second, from the perspective of analysis of robustness, one can view $X(n)$ as a perturbed version of $Y(n)$, where $X(n)$ is close to $Y(n)$, that is, $F(\cdot)$ can be close to the identity function. Third, the noise $\{X(n)\}$ is sometimes directly modeled by (16), with however an unknown $F(\cdot)$.

Following the same statistical inference procedure that lead to (9), we must now focus on the limit distribution of

$$\frac{1}{A(N)} \sum_{n=1}^{[Nt]} \Big(G \circ F(Y(n)) - \mathbb{E} G \circ F(Y(n)) \Big)$$

as $N \to \infty$.

Remark 2.11. We emphasize the different roles played by $F(\cdot)$ and $G(\cdot)$. The function $F(\cdot)$ can account for the fact that $F(Y(n))$ is the process of interest and that this process may not be Gaussian, or for an unknown and uncontrollable perturbation of the Gaussian $Y(n)$. Often, when $F(\cdot)$ is seen as a perturbation, it is assumed to yield a small or smooth deviation from the identity transform $F(x) = x$. In this case, the function $F(\cdot)$ may not be known precisely. On the other hand, the function $G(\cdot)$ depends on the statistical procedure of interest and is therefore typically precisely known.

We are now ready to make the following claim which will be justified by some mathematical arguments.

Claim 2.12. *It is typically the case that*

(a) the function $G \circ F$ has Hermite rank 1;

(b) the process $\{X(n)\}$ has long memory with the same Hurst index H as $\{Y(n)\}$.

Justification of the claim: Let Z be standard Gaussian. Requiring that the function $G \circ F$ to have Hermite rank $k \geq 2$ is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E}[(G \circ F)(Z)Z] = 0. \tag{17}$$

Such a requirement is very restrictive, and is, moreover, unrelated to the usual size or smoothness conditions typically imposed on the perturbation F. Unlike the precisely known $G(\cdot)$ which results from the method of inference, one has no control nor accurate knowledge of the function $F(\cdot)$. There is no a priori reason that that $F(\cdot)$ be such that (17) holds. But if (17) does not hold, then the Hermite rank of $G \circ F$ is 1, which justifies part (a) of the Claim 2.12.

Applying the same reasoning, the perturbation function $F(\cdot)$ is also very likely to be such that

$$\mathbb{E}[F(Z)Z] \neq 0$$

and hence to have Hermite rank 1. Then in view of Lemma 2.4 and Remark 2.5, this justifies part (b) of the Claim 2.12 (b). □

Remark 2.13. The Claim 2.12 expresses not only the instability of a Hermite rank higher than 1, but also the stability of the Hermite rank 1 and hence the Hurst index of the noise model. Instead, if $G \circ F$ has Hermite rank 1, by Theorem 2.6 and Remark 2.7, one has

$$\frac{1}{N^H} \sum_{n=1}^{[Nt]} \Big(G \circ F(Y(n)) - \mathbb{E}G \circ F(Y(n)) \Big) \Rightarrow cZ_{H,1}(t) = cB_H(t). \tag{18}$$

for some $c > 0$, where $B_H(t)$ is the fractional Brownian motion with Hurst index H. The theorem thus also expresses the stability of fractional Brownian motion as limit.

One may think of making Claim 2.12 a genuine mathematical statement by, for example, considering $F(\cdot)$ as a *random* element in a suitable function space with a "prior probability model", as long as that model assigns a small probability to the set of $F(\cdot)$ on which (17) happens. We consider for illustration the case where the perturbation is $F(y) = y + x$, namely, a level shift, In this case, $G \circ F(\cdot) = G(\cdot + x)$, and one has the following mathematical result:

Theorem 2.14. *Suppose that $G(\cdot) \in L^2(\gamma)$ is a non-constant function satisfying $G \circ F(\cdot) = G(\cdot + x) \in L^1(\gamma)$ with $x \in (-\delta, \delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then there exists an $\epsilon \in (0, \delta)$, so that the Hermite rank of $G \circ F(\cdot) = G(\cdot + x)$ is 1 for all $x \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \setminus \{0\}$.*

The proof of this theorem can be found in Bai and Taqqu [7]. The theorem says that an arbitrarily small level shift will force the Hermite rank to be equal to 1.

2.2 Non-instantaneous transformation

Let $Y(n)$ be still a standardized stationary long-memory Gaussian process with Hurst index H. The goal now is to extend the discussion on instantaneous transform (16) to non-instantaneous transforms:

$$X(n) = F\big(Y(n), Y(n-1), \ldots, Y(n-l)\big), \tag{19}$$

where $X(n) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and l is a finite positive integer. Since the non-instantaneous case is much less treated in the literature, we shall introduce in this section the relevant results in Dobrushin and Major [31], and show that the arguments developed in Section 2.1 continue to be valid.

It is well-known that the Gaussian $Y(n)$ admits the spectral representation (see, e.g., Dobrushin and Major [31])

$$Y(n) = \int_{(-\pi,\pi]} e^{inx} W_Y(dx), \tag{20}$$

where $W_Y(dx)$ is a complex-valued Gaussian measure satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}|W_Y(dx)|^2 = F_Y(dx) \tag{21}$$

and $F_Y(\cdot)$ is the spectral distribution[2] of $Y(n)$. Then $X(0)$ has following Wiener-Itô expansion (see Dobrushin and Major [31], formula (6.1), or Janson [51], Theorem 7.61):

$$X(0) - \mathbb{E}X(0) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} {\int_{(-\pi,\pi]^m}}'' \alpha_m(x_1, \ldots, x_m) W_Y(dx_1) \ldots W_Y(dx_m), \tag{22}$$

where $\alpha_m(\cdot)$'s are complex-valued functions in $L^2((-\pi,\pi]^m, F_Y^{\otimes m})$ such that

$$\alpha_m(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = \overline{\alpha_m(-x_1, \ldots, -x_m)},$$

the double prime $''$ indicates the exclusion of the hyper-diagonals $x_p = \pm x_q$ in the multiple stochastic integral, and

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m! \|\alpha_m\|^2_{L^2((-\pi,\pi]^m, F_Y^{\otimes m})} < \infty.$$

The *Hermite rank* of $X(n)$ (or say the Hermite rank of $F(\cdot)$ with respect to $\{Y(n)\}$) is defined as

$$\inf\left\{m \geq 1 : \ \|\alpha_m\|_{L^2((-\pi,\pi]^m, F_Y^{\otimes m})} \neq 0\right\}, \tag{23}$$

where

$$\|\alpha_m\|_{L^2((-\pi,\pi]^m, F_Y^{\otimes m})^2} = \int_{(-\pi,\pi]^m} |\alpha_m(x_1, \ldots, x_m)|^2 F_Y(dx_1) \ldots F_Y(dx_m).$$

It is possible to express (22) more explicitly. Let $Z_1, \ldots, Z_p$ $(p = l+1)$ be i.i.d. Gaussian variables obtained through an orthogonalization procedure from $\{Y(0), \ldots, Y(-l)\}$, so that, by (20),

$$Z_r = \sum_{s=0}^{l} a_{sr} Y(-s) = \int_{(-\pi,\pi]} \sum_{s=0}^{l} a_{sr} e^{-isx} W_Y(dx) = \int_{(-\pi,\pi]} h_r(x) W_Y(dx), \quad r = 1, \ldots, p, \tag{24}$$

where

$$h_r(x) = \sum_{s=0}^{l} a_{sr} e^{-isx}, \quad r = 1, \ldots, p \tag{25}$$

are orthonormal in $L^2((-\pi,\pi], F_Y)$. Since

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{j_1! \ldots j_p!}} H_{j_1}(\cdot) \otimes \ldots \otimes H_{j_p}(\cdot), \ j_1, \ldots, j_p \geq 0 \right\}$$

[2]Do not confuse F_Y in (21) with F in (19).

forms an orthonormal basis for $L^2(\gamma_p) := L^2(\mathbb{R}^p, \gamma^{\otimes p})$, one has the following expansion

$$X(0) - \mathbb{E}X(0) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{0 \le j_1, \ldots, j_p \le m \\ j_1 + \ldots + j_p = m}} c(j_1, \ldots, j_p) H_{j_1}(Z_1) \ldots H_{j_p}(Z_p). \tag{26}$$

Therefore, the *Hermite rank* of $X(n)$ is equal to

$$\inf \{m \ge 1 : \ c(j_1, \ldots, j_p) \ne 0 \ \text{ for some } \ j_1 + \ldots + j_p = m\},$$

which also equal to (see Dobrushin and Major [31] Remark 6.3)

$$\inf \Big\{ m \ge 1 : \ \mathbb{E}\Big[\big(X(0) - \mathbb{E}X(0)\big) Y(n)^m \Big] \ne 0 \ \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{Z} \Big\}. \tag{27}$$

This should be compared to (7).

Using the properties of Wiener-Itô integrals (Major [56] Theorem 4.3), one has

$$H_{j_1}(Z_1) \ldots H_{j_p}(Z_p) = \int''_{(-\pi,\pi]^m} h_1^{\otimes j_1} \ldots h_p^{\otimes j_p} W_F(dx_1) \ldots W_F(dx_m), \tag{28}$$

where $j_1 + \ldots + j_p = m$. Then comparing (22) and (26) yields

$$\alpha_m(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \sum_{\substack{0 \le j_1, \ldots, j_p \le m \\ j_1 + \ldots + j_p = m}} c(j_1, \ldots, j_p) h_1^{\otimes j_1} \ldots h_p^{\otimes j_p}. \tag{29}$$

We note that in view of (25), $\alpha_m(\cdot)$'s are bounded continuous functions, and $h_{j_s}(0) = \sum_{s=0}^{l} a_{sj}$. One has then

$$\alpha_m(0, \ldots, 0) = \sum_{\substack{0 \le j_1, \ldots, j_p \le m \\ j_1 + \ldots + j_p = m}} c(j_1, \ldots, j_p) \prod_{r=1}^{p} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{l} a_{sr} \right)^{j_r}. \tag{30}$$

Note that although the formula (30) involves the coefficients a_{sr}, the value of $\alpha_m(0, \ldots, 0)$ does not depend on the particular orthogonalization we choose. To see this, note that function α_m from the Wiener-Itô decomposition (22) is a.e. uniquely determined (see Janson [51], Theorem 7.61). Therefore, if α_m can be chosen to be continuous, which is the case here, the value $\alpha_m(0, \ldots, 0)$ must be unique.

We are now ready to state the following generalization of Theorem 2.6, which follows from Dobrushin and Major [31] Theorem 3, Remark 6.3 and Remark 6.4.

Theorem 2.15. *Suppose that $X(n) = F(Y(n), \ldots, Y(n-l))$, and that the Hermite rank in the sense of (23) is k, and that the Hurst index H of $\{Y(n)\}$ satisfies*

$$H > 1 - \frac{1}{2k}.$$

Suppose also that $\alpha_k(\cdot)$ in (22) satisfies

$$\alpha_k(0, \ldots, 0) \ne 0. \tag{31}$$

Then $\{X(n)\}$ has long memory with Hurst index:

$$H_F = (H-1)k + 1 \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1 \right).$$

Furthermore, as $N \to \infty$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N^{H_F}} \sum_{n=1}^{[Nt]} \Big(X(n) - \mathbb{E}X(n) \Big) \Rightarrow c\alpha_k(0, \ldots, 0) Z_{H_F,k}(t), \tag{32}$$

for some $c \ne 0$, where $Z_{H_F,k}(t)$ is the Hermite process in (13).

Remark 2.16. In contrast to Theorem 2.6 where the constant c in (12) is always nonzero, in the non-instantaneous case we need to assume in addition the condition (31). If $\alpha_k(0,\ldots,0) = 0$, then (32) tells nothing more than that the normalization N^{-H_F} is too strong. In this case, terms with order greater than k may contribute to the asymptotic distribution as well. For example, if in (19) we let

$$X(n) = H_1(Y(n)) - H_1(Y(n-1)) + H_2(Y(n)) = Y(n) - Y(n-1) + Y(n)^2 - 1.$$

Using the spectral representation (20) and Major [56] Theorem 4.3 (see also (28)), we have

$$X(0) = \int_{(-\pi,\pi]} (1 - e^{-ix}) W_Y(dx) + \int''_{(-\pi,\pi]^2} W_Y(dx_1) W_Y(dx_2)$$

so that $\alpha_1(x) = 1 - e^{-ix}$ and $\alpha_1(0) = 0$. On ther other hand, the Hermite rank of $X(n)$ is $k = 1$ in view of (22) and (23). Now

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} X(n) = Y(N) - Y(0) + \sum_{n=1}^{N} H_2(Y(n)).$$

Since $Y(n)$ is stationary, $N^{-H}[Y(N) - Y(0)] \xrightarrow{p} 0$, and thus only the term $\sum_{n=1}^{N} H_2(Y(n))$ contributes to in the limit. Hence the limit of suitably normalized $\sum_{n=1}^{N} X(n)$ can be either a Brownian motion if $H \leq 3/4$ in view of Remark 2.9, or a Hermite process of order 2 if $H > 3/4$ in view of Theorem 2.6.

Remark 2.17. Now arguing as in Section 2.1, one notes that a Hermite rank higher than 1 in this non-instantaneous context is also unstable. Recall that the role of $F(\cdot)$ in (19), as in Section 2.1, is to account for an uncontrollable perturbation of the Gaussian model. Suppose that $G(\cdot)$ is a function determined by the statistical procedure of interest. Then one can formulate a statement parallel to Claim 2.12. So the part of Theorem 2.15 which is most likely of statistical relevance is just the case $k = 1$, where the limit is fractional Brownian motion and the normalization is N^{-H}. Note that this non-instantaneous consideration includes not only $G(X(n))$ with $X(n)$ defined in (19), but also the case where $G(\cdot)$ is a finite-dimensional multivariate function of the observed time series $\{X(n)\}$, for example $G(X(n),\ldots,X(n-p)) = X(n)X(n-p)$, a term which appears in the sample covariance.

Arguing as in Claim 2.12, condition (31) should be expected to typically hold in practice.

Remark 2.18. Using the full generality of Theorem 3 of Dobrushin and Major [31], it is even possible to consider the case $l = \infty$ in (19), namely, including dependence on the infinite past. In this case, however, one encounters major technical difficulties since $F(\cdot)$ with $l = \infty$ may alter the long memory property of $Y(n)$, for example, if $F(\cdot)$ is a linear filter with a slow power-law decay (see, e.g., Section 2.3 below). On the other hand, one may be satisfied with the restriction to $l < \infty$ since $F(\cdot)$ has been introduced only to account for a small perturbation of the Gaussian model, in which case the argument of $F(\cdot)$ is not expected to stretch to the infinite past.

Remark 2.19. This discussion can also be extended to the case where we have a vector-valued Gaussian stationary noise $\mathbf{Y}(n)$. See, e.g., Denaranjo [29] and Arcones [1].

2.3 Linear process model

A popular model for a stationary, not necessarily Gaussian, noise $\{Y(n)\}$ is the so-called (causal) linear process:

$$Y(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_{n-i}\epsilon_i, \tag{33}$$

where ϵ_i's are assumed to be i.i.d. random variables (not necessarily Gaussian) with mean 0 and variance 1 and $\sum_n a_n^2 < \infty$. When

$$a_n \approx n^{H-3/2}, \quad 1/2 < H < 1 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty, \tag{34}$$

one has $\mathrm{Cov}[X(n), X(0)] \approx n^{2H-2}$, and thus $Y(n)$ has long memory with Hurst index H. The well-known fractionally-integrated noise model (see, e.g., Granger and Joyeux [39]) satisfies (34). We shall assume (34) throughout this section.

Theorem 2.6 can be extended to linear processes. In this case, the larger class of polynomials called Appell polynomials (Avram and Taqqu [2]) plays an analogous role to that of the Hermite polynomial in Section 2.1. One can define the so-called *Appell* rank of a function $G(\cdot)$ as in (5), with Hermite polynomials replaced by the Appell polynomials, given that the expansion is valid (for example, when $G(\cdot)$ is a finite-order polynomial). However, in this framework (Surgailis [70]), the class of functions $G(\cdot)$'s that can be treated is rather restrictive. Ho and Hsing [45] greatly extended the allowable $G(\cdot)$'s through a martingale difference approach and introduced a more convenient notion of rank, which we shall call the *power rank*. See Lévy-Leduc and Taqqu [53].

Given a function $G(\cdot)$ and a random variable Y satisfying $\mathbb{E}G(Y)^2 < \infty$, set $\widetilde{G}(y) = G(y) - \mathbb{E}G(Y)$. Let

$$G_\infty(y) = \mathbb{E}\widetilde{G}(Y + y)$$

given that the expectation exists and suppose that $G_\infty(\cdot)$ has derivatives of order sufficiently high. The power rank of $G(\cdot)$ with respect to Y is defined as

$$\inf\{m \geq 1 : \ G_\infty^{(m)}(0) \neq 0\}, \tag{35}$$

where $G_\infty^{(m)}(y)$ denotes the m-th derivative of $G_\infty(y)$. The power rank coincides with the Hermite rank if Y is Gaussian (see Bai and Taqqu [7]).

Now we can state the following non-central limit theorem of Ho and Hsing [45] (for simplicity we omit the inclusion of some technical conditions):

Theorem 2.20. *Let $Y(n)$ be as in (33) - (34). Suppose that $\mathbb{E}G(Y(0))^2 < \infty$ and $G(\cdot)$ has power rank $k \geq 1$ with respect to $Y(0)$ in the sense of (35). Suppose that the Hurst index satisfies*

$$H > 1 - \frac{1}{2k}. \tag{36}$$

Under some additional technical conditions (see Corollary 3.3 of Ho and Hsing [45]), $\{G(Y(n))\}$ has long memory with Hurst index:

$$H_G = (H-1)k + 1 \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right).$$

Furthermore, as $N \to \infty$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N^{H_G}} \sum_{n=1}^{[Nt]} \Big(G(Y(n)) - \mathbb{E}G(Y(n))\Big) \Rightarrow cZ_{H_G,k}(t), \tag{37}$$

for some $c \neq 0$, where $Z_{H_G,k}(t)$ is the Hermite process defined in (13).

Remark 2.21. When (36) is replaced by $H < 1 - \frac{1}{2k}$, analogously to the Breuer-Major central limit theorem, we have $H_G = 1/2$, and convergence to Brownian motion is obtained. See, e.g., Ho and Hsing [45] Corollary 3.8.

Remark 2.22. Using similar arguments as Section 2.1, one sees that a power rank higher than 1 is also unstable to perturbation. To get a power rank higher than 1, one needs the restrictive condition

$$G_\infty^{(1)}(0) = \frac{d}{dy}\mathbb{E}G(Y + y)|_{y=0} = 0.$$

which is easily perturbed by compositing it with a nonlinear function. An exact analog of Claim 2.12 can thus be stated in this context. So in statistical practice, it is most likely that only the case $k = 1$ is relevant, with the limit being a fractional Brownian motion. As far as we know, the extension of Theorem 2.20 to non-instantaneous filters of linear processes, that is, an analogue of Theorem 2.15. Only central limit theorems involving non-instantaneous filter of linear processes have been considered (see Wu [75] and Cheng and Ho [18]).

Remark 2.23. In the Gaussian subordination case, one could perhaps justify the inclusion of an underlying Gaussian $\{Y(n)\}$ by the central limit theorem. There is, however, less "physical" reason to consider an analog of the specification (15) or (19) when $Y(n)$ is a general linear process (33). One can also argue that a linear process model lacks physical justification. Nevertheless, a model is only an approximation to reality and linear models are convenient. If one then wants to consider an asymptotic result based on a linear process model, the result should possess some robustness against the perturbation of the linear process by a nonlinear transform as in (19).

Remark 2.24. We mention that Surgailis [71] established some results which can be interpreted as the "invariance" of Theorem 2.20 against additive noise. Roughly speaking, Surgailis [71] showed that if the long memory linear process $Y(n)$ is replaced by $Y'(n) = Y(n) + U(n)$ with $U(n)$ specified as some short-memory models, then the non-central convergence in Theorem 2.20 still holds, where the power (or Appell) rank is now with respect to the distribution of $Y'(n)$. Although this result is of theoretical interest, it does not suggest that it is practical to consider higher order power (or Appell) rank. Firstly, the rank is still unstable under nonlinear transform. While the additive noise $U(n)$ can be viewed as a sensible type of perturbation of the linear process model, a nonlinear transform can also occur in practice. Secondly, even without considering a nonlinear transform, one has typically no accurate knowledge of the marginal distribution of $Y'(n)$. Moreover, adding the noise $U(n)$ will disturb the distribution and hence affect the rank defined through (35).

Remark 2.25. Consider a generalization of the model (33) to the following Volterra-type homogeneous form

$$Y(n) = \sum_{0 \le i_1, \ldots, i_k < \infty} a(i_1, \ldots, i_k) \epsilon_{n-i_1} \ldots \epsilon_{n-i_k}, \tag{38}$$

or more generally, a linear combination of such $Y(n)$'s with different order k's. In the case (38), by assuming that $a(\cdot)$ decays slowly as some suitable homogeneous function, one can obtain non-central limit theorems for normalized sum of $Y(n)$ with a rich class of limits containing the Hermite process $Z_{H,k}(t)$ in (13) as a special case. See Bai and Taqqu [4, 6, 5] for more details. In the long memory case, there is no simple class of universal limits (in contrast to obtaining Brownian motion in the short memory case).

Remark 2.26. It is interesting that a Gaussian limit still typically holds under a nonlinear transform perturbation. However, it is important to consider not only the limit that one obtains but also the normalization since the normalization corresponds to the magnitude of the fluctuations of the partial sum. When the true rank (Hermite or power) is indeed 1, but one assumes a higher-order Hermite rank from statistical consideration, it will lead to an underestimation of the magnitude of the fluctuations of the partial sum since $H_G < H$ in Theorem 2.6, 2.15 and 2.20.

3 Empirical evidence

In this section, we provide empirical evidence to support the preceding discussion of instability of ranks in the non-central limit theorems.

Consider the rank of the quadratic transform $G(x) = x^2$. It is always 2, in both Gaussian and linear subordination context. This means that if $\{X(n)\}$ is exactly a centered Gaussian or linear process with Hurst index $H > 1/2$, then the Hurst index of the transformed series $\{X(n)^2\}$ should be

$$H_G = \max\left(\frac{1}{2}, 2H - 1\right) < H, \tag{39}$$

in view of Theorem 2.6 (see also Remark 2.9) and Theorem 2.20 (see also Remark 2.21). Note that when $H < 0.75$, the resulting Hurst index is always $H_G = 0.5$.

Here is the question: if $\{X(n)\}$ is a real-life centered stationary data in which displays long memory, does one typically observe the decrease from H to H_G as in (39) when $\{X(n)\}$ is replaced by $\{X(n)^2\}$? If our arguments in the previous sections make practical sense, then the time series $\{X(n)^2\}$ should be likely to still possess rank 1, which means that (39) should barely happen. To test this hypothesis, we design the following empirical study which involves $\{X(n)\}$ and $\{X(n)^2\}$. The design is explained in Remark 3.1 below.

Design of the study:
Suppose that we have a collection of M real-life stationary long-memory time series data

$$\{X_m(n),\ n = 1, \ldots, N_m\ m = 1, \ldots, M.\},$$

where n is the time index, and m is the data set index. For each m, we perform the following analysis.

Step 1 *For each $m = 1, \ldots, M$, center the data: $X_m(n) \leftarrow X_m(n) - \frac{1}{N_m}\sum_{n=1}^{N_m} X_m(n)$;*

Step 2 *For each $m = 1, \ldots, M$, obtain the estimated the Hurst index $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)}$ of $\{X_m(n),\ n = 1, \ldots, N_m\}$ and the estimated Hurst index $\widehat{H}_m^{(2)}$ of $\{X_m(n)^2,\ n = 1, \ldots, N_m\}$;*

Step 3 *For each $m = 1, \ldots, M$, simulate R independent sequences of fractional Gaussian noise (increments of fractional Brownian motion): $\{G_{mr}(n),\ n = 1, \ldots, N_m,\ r = 1, \ldots, R\}$, all with Hurst index $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)}$. Obtain the estimated Hurst index $\widehat{h}_{mr}^{(1)}$ of $\{G_{mr}(n),\ n = 1, \ldots, N_m\}$ and the estimated Hurst index $\widehat{h}_{mr}^{(2)}$ of $\{G_{mr}(n)^2,\ n = 1, \ldots, N_m\}$, for each $r = 1, \ldots, R$.*

Step 4 *For each $m = 1, \ldots, M$, compute the percentile of the value*

$$\delta_m = \widehat{H}_m^{(2)} - \max(\frac{1}{2}, 2\widehat{H}_m^{(1)} - 1)$$

in the set $\left\{\delta_{mr} := \widehat{h}_{mr}^{(2)} - \max\left(\frac{1}{2}, 2\widehat{h}_{mr}^{(1)} - 1\right),\ r = 1, \ldots, R\right\}$ as

$$P_m = \frac{1}{R}\#\{\delta_{mr} :\ \delta_{mr} \le \delta_m,\ r = 1, \ldots, R\} = \widehat{F}_m(\delta_m),$$

where $\widehat{F}_m$ is the empirical CDF of $\{\delta_{mr} :\ r = 1, \ldots, R\}$;

Step 5 *Construct the following contrast group: for each $m = 1, \ldots, M$, simulate a fractional Gaussian noise sequence $\{X_m^*(n),\ n = 1, \ldots, N_m^*\}$ with Hurst index randomly sampled from $\{\widehat{H}_m^{(1)},\ m = 1, \ldots, M\}$, and length N_m^* randomly sampled from $\{N_m,\ m = 1, \ldots, M\}$. Then perform the preceding steps 1-4 replacing $\{X_m(n)\}$ by $\{X_m^*(n)\}$, from which one gets $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)*}$, $\widehat{H}_m^{(2)*}$, δ_m^* and P_m^* that correspond to $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)}$, $\widehat{H}_m^{(2)}$, δ_m and P_m respectively.*

In our study we set $R = 200$.

Remark 3.1. We explain here the preceding study design. Recall that $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)}$ is the Hurst index estimate of the time series $\{X_m(n)\}$ and $\widehat{H}_m^{(2)}$ is the Hurst index estimate of the squared time series $\{X_m(n)^2\}$. As mentioned before, the goal is to examine whether $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)}$ and $\widehat{H}_m^{(2)}$ behave according to (39). If they behave perfectly according to (39), then

$$\delta_m = \widehat{H}_m^{(2)} - \max\left(\frac{1}{2}, 2\widehat{H}_m^{(1)} - 1\right)$$

should be zero. Both $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)}$ and $\widehat{H}_m^{(2)}$ are, however, estimators that fluctuate randomly and potentially differently cross different m's. To get a reference point, we introduce a statistical contrast in Step 3, where $\widehat{h}_{mr}^{(1)}$ and $\widehat{h}_{mr}^{(2)}$ are obtained from the fractional Gaussian noise which indeed obeys (39). We want to see how extreme δ_m tends to be relative to the fluctuation of $\delta_{mr} = \widehat{h}_{mr}^{(2)} - \max\left(\frac{1}{2}, 2\widehat{h}_{mr}^{(1)} - 1\right)$ which corresponds to fractional Gaussian noise. This leads us to focus on P_m instead of δ_m. One may view P_m as a "standardized" version of δ_m with respect to the contrast distribution constructed from fractional Gaussian noise, which makes comparison across different data items (different m) more consistent. More technical explanations are given below.



Figure 1: Up: Time series extracted from ca506.crn in ITRDB. Down: autocorrelation plot. Variance aggregation estimate yields that the Hurst index of data is $\widehat{H}^{(1)} = 0.7182$, and the Hurst index of the centered and squared data is $\widehat{H}^{(2)} = 0.7217$; local periodogram regression yields $\widehat{H}^{(1)} = 0.7569$ and $\widehat{H}^{(2)} = 0.7801$; local Whittle estimate yields $\widehat{H}^{(1)} = 0.7024$ and $\widehat{H}^{(2)} = 0.7061$.

Let $F_m(x)$ be the CDF of the random δ_m. Then $F_m(\delta_m)$ follows exactly a *uniform distribution* on $[0,1]$. If $\{X_m(n)\}$ were indeed generated by fractional Gaussian noise with true Hurst index $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)}$, then the empirical CDF $\widehat{F}_m$ in Step 4 is a good approximation of F_m. Therefore, if $\{X_m(n)\}$ obeys (39) as the fractional Gaussian noise does, and $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)}$ is a reasonable estimate, then $P_m = \widehat{F}_m(\delta_m)$ in Step 4 is expected to follow a *uniform distribution* on $[0,1]$ approximately. On the other hand, if the δ_m computed from the data makes the distribution of $P_m = \widehat{F}_m(\delta_m)$ skewed towards 1, then this indicates that δ_m tends to be larger than δ_{mr}.

To account for the potential bias due to the estimation of Hurst index, in Step 5 we replace our original tree ring data $\{X_m(n)\}$ by a second contrast group $\{X_m^*(n)\}$ made up of fractional Gaussian noise sequences with similar lengths and Hurst indices. After repeating the same procedure on this contrast group, we can then compare the distribution (histogram) of $\{P_m\}$ obtained from the original data with the distribution of $\{P_m^*\}$ obtained from the contrast group.

These designs may be regarded as simulation-assisted statistical tests where the null hypothesis is the relation (39).

Now we describe the data we use. The *tree ring width* in chronological order has been identified as one of the natural stationary time series data sets which exhibit long memory (see Mandelbrot and Wallis [57] and Pelletier and Turcotte [61]). Since the tree ring width is largely affected by environmental factors, which is explored in dendrochronology (see Schweingruber [67]), it also reflects the long-memory stationary fluctuation of the ecological systems. We shall use the data compiled by The International Tree-Ring Data Bank (ITRDB, `ftp://ftp.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/paleo/treering/chronologies/`) collected from Africa, Asia, Australia, Canada, Europe, Mexico, South America and USA, stored in the Standard Chronology File (*.crn) format. For example, Figure 1 displays the time series extracted from the file ca506.crn in the data bank and its autocorrelation plot. We further select the data according to the following criteria:

Criterion 1 The length of the time series is at least 300.

Criterion 2 The time series data is importable by the Tree-Ring Matlab Toolbox[3] (data is usually importable if there is no missing value).

[3] `http://www.ltrr.arizona.edu/~dmeko/toolbox.html`

Estimator	Selected number M	Median δ_m	Median δ_m^*	Median P_m	Median P_m^*
Variance Aggregation	1250	0.0786	0.0104	80.50%	51.00%
Local Periodogram Regression	658	0.0921	-0.0204	86.25%	63.50%
Local Whittle	908	0.0496	-0.0162	80.50%	52.50%

Table 1: Summary of analysis

Criterion 3 The estimated Hurst index $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)}$ lies within the interval $[0.6, 0.9]$[4].

To be consistent, we also apply Criterion 1 and Criterion 3 for to the contrast group $\{X_m^*(n),\ n = 1, \ldots, N_m\}$.

We shall use the following three popular estimators of Hurst index:

- Variance aggregation estimator;
- Local periodogram regression estimator (also known as GPH estimator);
- Local Whittle estimator.

For a description and empirical study of these estimators, see Taqqu et al. [74]. There are more sophisticated estimators, for example, the wavelet-type estimators (see, e.g., Faÿ et al. [35]). To minimize finite-sample bias, these methods typically involve complicated choice of some tuning parameters. Since our study design has taken into account the potential bias of the estimator, we shall stick to the three more elementary estimators aforementioned. For the variance aggregation estimator and the local periodogram regression (GPH estimator), we use the implementation by Chu Chen (`http://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/19148-hurst-p` and we use the default parameter settings); For the local Whittle estimate, we use the implementation by Katsumi Shimotsu (`http://shimotsu.web.fc2.com/Site/Matlab_Codes.html`), in which case we choose the frequency cutoff threshold to be $[N^{2/3}]$ with N being the length of the time series).

Observations:

Table 1 summarizes some key statistics of the analysis based on the three different estimators. One can see that for all three estimators, the median of δ_m is consistently smaller than that of the contrast δ_m^*. The median of P_m is significantly smaller than that of the contrast P_m^*. Figure 2, 3 and 4 plot the histograms of $\{P_m\}$ and $\{P_m^*\}$ obtained via the three different estimators. Their results are similar: while $\{P_m^*\}$ are roughly uniformly distributed as expected, the histogram of $\{P_m\}$ is severely skewed towards 1. The contrast in the skewness shows that the δ_m computed from the tree ring data tends to be larger than the $\{\delta_{mr}\}$ computed from the fractional Gaussian noise. In other words, in the case of tree ring data, the Hurst index does *not* tend to decrease as much after squaring as the case of fractional Gaussian noise.

As mentioned in Remark 3.1, if the Hurst index estimate is unbiased, P_m^* is expected to approximately follow a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$, so that the median is close to $1/2$. However, the estimation bias of Hurst index could distort this uniformity. Indeed, in the Local Periodogram Regression case, the median of P_m^* is 63.5%. But this is still in sharp contrast with the corresponding median of P_m which is 86.25% and hence significantly larger. This indicates that the data is not behaving like fractional Gaussian noise. Thus our design is effective despite the bias inherent in the estimation method.

Remark 3.2. From the analysis above, we conclude that relation (39), or more generally (11), may not make good prediction on real-life data. We note, however, that the estimated Hurst index $\widehat{H}_m^{(2)}$ of $\{X_m(n)^2\}$ tends to be somewhat smaller than the estimated Hurst index $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)}$ of $\{X_m(n)\}$, although for the contrast group $\{X^*(n)\}$ the decrease from $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)*}$ to $\widehat{H}_m^{(2)*}$ is more significant. See Figure 5. A possible explanation is that although $\{X_m(n)^2\}$ actually possesses rank 1 and thus has the same Hurst index as $\{X_m(n)\}$, many of the $\{X_m(n)^2\}$ may be close to a Gaussian (or linear) process. So they tend to exhibit somewhat the relation (39) when the sample size is moderate.

[4]Ideally we want the selected data to be stationary and long-range dependent. When the estimate is close to 0.5, the data is likely to have short memory; when the estimate is close to 1, it is likely to be non-stationary.



Figure 2: Histogram of $\{P_m\}$ (left) v.s. $\{P_m^*\}$ (right) from the Variance Aggregation Estimator



Figure 3: Histogram of $\{P_m\}$ (left) v.s. $\{P_m^*\}$ (right) from the Local Periodogram Regression



Figure 4: Histogram of $\{P_m\}$ (left) v.s. $\{P_m^*\}$ (right) from the Local Whittle Estimator

4 Stability of limit theorems under weak dependence

In this section, we demonstrate that the instability phenomenon appearing in the non-central limit theorems under long memory does not typically occur in the short-memory case. This is important because it shows that the nonlinear transform considered as "perturbation" in the previous section usually does not make any qualitative difference in normal (short-memory) situations and hence may be safely negligible in large sample inference.

There are many ways to mathematically characterize weak dependence. For an introduction to various notions of weak dependence of stationary processes and corresponding limit theorems, we refer to Doukhan [32]. In this section, we shall mainly look at the following three as examples:

(1) Fast-decaying mixing coefficients under strong mixing conditions;

(2) Fast decaying covariance function in Gaussian subordination model (Theorem 4.2);

(3) Fast decaying physical dependence measure of Wu [76] in Bernoulli shift models.

The first is by far the most widely-used notion for weak dependence which applies to very general stationary processes. The second is mentioned due to its close connection to the considerations in Section 2.1 and 2.2. The third is a convenient criterion under the Bernoulli shift framework which covers a wide range of concrete statistical models.

4.1 Strong mixing conditions

Suppose that $\{X(n)\}$ is a stationary process with $\mathbb{E}[X(n)] = 0$ and $\mathrm{Var}[X(n)] = 1$. Define the σ-field $\mathcal{F}_a^b = \sigma\{X(n) : a \le n \le b\}$, where $-\infty \le a \le b \le +\infty$. Given two σ-fields $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$, one can define the following measure of dependence

$$\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup\{|P(A \cap B) - P(A)P(B)| : \ A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}\}. \tag{40}$$

Then the α-mixing coefficient of $\{X(n)\}$, first introduced in Rosenblatt [65], is defined as

$$\alpha_X(n) = \alpha\left(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^0, \mathcal{F}_n^\infty\right).$$

When $\alpha_X(n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, we say that $\{X(n)\}$ is *strong mixing*. If one assumes that $\alpha(n)$ decays to zero fast enough together with some other regularity conditions, then a central limit theorem for $X(n)$ can be established. We state, as an example, the following central limit theorem due to Ibragimov [48] and Herrndorf [42].



Figure 5: Top to down: variance aggregation estimator, local periodogram regression and local Whittle estimator. In each boxplot, from left to right: $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)}$, $\widehat{H}_m^{(2)}$, $\widehat{H}_m^{(1)*}$ and $\widehat{H}_m^{(2)*}$.

Theorem 4.1. *If* $\mathbb{E}|X(n)|^{2+\delta} < \infty$ *for some* $\delta > 0$ *and*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_X(n)^{\delta/(2+\delta)} < \infty, \tag{41}$$

then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=1}^{[Nt]} \Big(X(n) - \mathbb{E}X(n) \Big) \Rightarrow \sigma B(t).$$

where $B(t)$ *is a standard Brownian motion,* $\Rightarrow$ *stands for weak convergence in* $D[0,1]$*, and*

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cov}[X(n), X(0)].$$

Now consider the nonlinear transform perturbation in (19), namely, $Y(n) = F(X(n), \ldots, X(n-l))$. Let us compare α_X and α_Y. Since $Y(n) \in \mathcal{F}_{n-l}^{n}$, it is easily deduced that for $n > l$, the α-mixing coefficient of $\{Y(n)\}$ satisfies

$$\alpha_Y(n) \leq \alpha_X(n-l). \tag{42}$$

The relation (42) means that the dependence measured by the α-mixing coefficient after the perturbing tranform $F(\cdot)$ cannot exceed that of the original process $X(n)$ (up to a fixed lag l). In particular, relation (41) holds for $\alpha_Y(n)$. One then only needs $\mathbb{E}|Y(n)|^{2+\delta} < \infty$ (which is the case if $F(\cdot)$ has at most linear growth) for Theorem 4.1 to hold.

There are different mixing coefficients than $\alpha(n)$, obtained by modifying the measure of dependence between the σ-fields in (40), for example, the ϕ-mixing coefficient defined through

$$\phi(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup\{|P(A|B) - P(A)| : \ A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}, P(B) > 0\},$$

the ρ-mixing coefficient defined through

$$\rho(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup\{\mathrm{Corr}(X, Y) : \ X \in L^2(\mathcal{A}), Y \in L^2(\mathcal{B})\},$$

and so on. In general, as long as a dependence measure $m(\cdot, \cdot)$ is non-increasing with respect to set inclusion and the mixing coefficient is defined as $m(n) = m(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{0}, \mathcal{F}_{n}^{\infty})$, then a relation like (42) always holds.

Hence, the central limit theorems under strong mixing conditions is robust against a nonlinear transform perturbation.

4.2 Gaussian subordination

Consider a setup similar to Section 2.2: let $\{Y(n)\}$ be a stationary *Gaussia* process, and let the

$$X(n) = F(Y(n), \ldots, Y(n-l)).$$

In contrast to the situation in Section 2.2, when the covariance function of $Y(n)$ decays fast enough, a central limit theorem always holds for $X(n)$. In particular, we have the following result which is a consequence of Ho and Sun [46].

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that*

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |\mathrm{Cov}\,[Y(n), Y(0)]| < \infty. \tag{43}$$

Then one has

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=1}^{[Nt]} \Big(X(n) - \mathbb{E}X(n) \Big) \stackrel{f.d.d.}{\longrightarrow} \sigma B(t),$$

where $B(t)$ *is a standard Brownian motion and*

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cov}[X(n), X(0)].$$

Theorem 4.2 directly expresses the robustness of the central limit theorem against nonlinear transform perturbation when the short memory condition (43) is imposed on $Y(n)$.

4.3 Bernoulli shift

Let $\{\epsilon_i\}$ be an i.i.d. sequence of random variables with mean 0 and variance 1. Consider the Bernoulli shift model

$$X(n) = G_X(\epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n-1}, \ldots), \tag{44}$$

where G_X is a non-random function on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$. This specification covers not only the causal linear process (33), but also many nonlinear time series models obtained as solutions of difference equations involving ϵ_i.

Wu [76] introduced the following so-called *physical dependence measure* for a process $\{X(n)\}$ specified by (44). Let ϵ_0^* be a random variable independent of $\{\epsilon_i\}$ and having the same distribution as ϵ_0. Define

$$\delta_2^X(n) = \|G_X(\epsilon_n, \ldots, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_{-1}, \ldots) - G_X(\epsilon_n, \ldots, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_0^*, \epsilon_{-1}, \ldots)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{45}$$

If (44) is interpreted as a nonlinear system with input $\{\epsilon_n\}$ and output $\{X(n)\}$, then $\delta_2(n)$ in (45) measures the influence of the lag-n input ϵ_0 on the current output $X(n)$.

With $\delta_2(n)$, one can state the following central limit theorem, which is a consequence of Theorem 1 and 3 of Wu [76].

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \delta_2^X(n) < \infty. \tag{46}$$

Then one has

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=1}^{[Nt]} \Big(X(n) - \mathbb{E}X(n) \Big) \Rightarrow \sigma B(t).$$

where $B(t)$ is a standard Brownian motion, $\Rightarrow$ stands for weak convergence in $D[0,1]$, and

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cov}[X(n), X(0)].$$

Remark 4.4. The criterion (46) is typically easier to check for a specific Bernoulli shift model than the criteria based on strong mixing conditions (see Theorem 4.1), while still providing numerous statistical applications.

Now we consider the nonlinear transform perturbation. In this case, we need to assume some smoothness condition (compare with the arguments of Claim 2.12) on the perturbation function $F(x_1, \ldots, x_l)$. In particular, suppose that $F(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz:

$$|F(x_1, \ldots, x_l) - F(y_1, \ldots, y_l)| \le C_F \sum_{i=1}^{l} |x_i - y_i| \tag{47}$$

for some constant $C_F \ge 0$. Let $Y(n) = G_Y(\epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n-1}, \ldots)$ and let

$$X(n) = F(Y(n), \ldots, Y(n-l)) =: G_X(\epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n-1}, \ldots).$$

Now by (47), writing $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_n = (\epsilon_n, \ldots, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_{-1}, \ldots)$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_n^* = (\epsilon_n, \ldots, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_0^*, \epsilon_{-1}, \ldots)$, one has

$$|G_X(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_n) - G_X(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_n^*)| \le C_F \sum_{i=1}^{l} |G_Y(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{n-i}) - G_Y(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{n-i}^*)|.$$

Therefore, if $\delta_2^X(n)$ and $\delta_2^Y(n)$ are the physical dependence measures of $\{X(n)\}$ and $\{Y(n)\}$ respectively, then

$$\delta_2^X(n) = \|G_X(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_n) - G_X(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_n^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C_F \sum_{i=1}^{l} \delta_2^Y(n-l).$$

Hence if $\{Y(n)\}$ satisfies the short memory condition $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \delta_2^Y(n) < \infty$, then so does $\{X(n)\}$. This shows the robustness of Theorem 4.3 against a perturbation by any Lipschitz nonlinear transform.

Remark 4.5. The proof of Theorem 4.3 is based on a martingale difference approximation method and resorts to the martingale difference central limit theorem. We note, however, that the martingale difference central limit theorem is itself not robust against nonlinear transform, since the martingale difference structure in general can be easily disturbed by a nonlinear transform. For example, in the stochastic volatility-type models, e.g., the LARCH(∞) model (Giraitis et al. [37]), the return sequence $X(n)$ is a martingale difference, while $X(n)^2$ can exhibit long memory (see Beran et al. [13], Chapter 4.2.8.).

Remark 4.6. Using similar consideration, one can show that the θ-weak dependence criterion (whose definition involves bounded Lipschitz transform) introduced by Doukhan and Louhichi [33], enjoys a robustness against bounded Lipschitz transform.

5 Examples in Statistics

In this section, we review some statistical problems studied in the literature which involve applying non-central limit theorems. In the spirit of the discussions in Section 2, we shall demonstrate how the asymptotic statistical theories are affected if one assumes that the rank is always 1, regardless of the nonlinear transform chosen by the inference procedure. We also discuss some other possibilities for carrying out valid inference without relying on rank.

5.1 Sample variance

In the context of long memory, with the complexity introduced by non-central limit theorems, even a problem as elementary as estimation of the variance becomes perplexing. We only discuss the case where the data $\{X(n)\}$ is a Gaussian process, while everything said can be extended to $\{X(n)\}$ being a linear process (see Section 2.3).

Assume that $\{X(n)\}$ is a long memory stationary Gaussian process with Hurst index $H \in (1/2, 1)$, unknown mean μ and unknown variance σ^2. Consider the estimation of σ^2 using the sample variance:

$$\widehat{\sigma}_N^2 := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left(X(n) - \bar{X}_N\right)^2, \tag{48}$$

where $\bar{X}_N = (X(1) + \ldots + X(N))/N$ is the sample mean. In the short memory situation, say if $X(n)$ were i.i.d., it is well known that $\widehat{\sigma}_N^2$ is asymptotically normal. The situation is, however, subtle. Indeed, write first

$$\widehat{\sigma}_N^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} (X(n) - \mu)^2 + (\bar{X}_N - \mu)^2 =: U_N + V_N. \tag{49}$$

Note that the term $(X(n) - \mu)^2$ has Hermite rank 2 with expectation σ^2.

When $H < 3/4$, in view of Breuer-Major central limit theorem (see Remark 2.9), we write

$$U_N - \sigma^2 = N^{-1/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left((X(n) - \mu)^2 - \sigma^2\right),$$

and in view of Theorem 2.6 with $k = 1$, we write

$$V_N = N^{2H-2} \left(\frac{1}{N^H} \sum_{n=1}^{N} [X(n) - \mu] \right)^2. \tag{50}$$

Since $H < 3/4$ implies $2H - 2 < -1/2$, only the term U_N contributes to the asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\sigma}_N^2$ as $N \to \infty$:

$$N^{1/2}(\widehat{\sigma}_N^2 - \sigma^2) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, s_1^2)$$

for some $s_1 > 0$.

When $H > 3/4$, in view of Theorem 2.6 with $k = 2$, we write

$$U_N - \sigma^2 = N^{2H-2} \frac{1}{N^{2H-1}} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left((X(n) - \mu)^2 - \sigma^2 \right),$$

and V_N is as in (50). Now both U_N and V_N contribute to the limit, where we have by a multivariate version of Theorem 2.6 (see, e.g, Bai and Taqqu [3]):

$$N^{2H-2}(\widehat{\sigma}_N^2 - \sigma^2) \xrightarrow{d} a_H Z_{2H-1,2}(1) + b_H Z_{2H-1,1}(1)^2 \tag{51}$$

where $Z_{2H-1,k}(t), k = 1, 2$ are the Hermite processes in (13) defined by the same Brownian integrator $B(\cdot)$. for some constants $a_H, b_H > 0$. See also Dehling and Taqqu [26].

Remark 5.1. The case $H > 3/4$ discussed above is also related to Theorem 2.14. We follow the notation in Theorem 2.14, where $Y(n)$ is a standardized long memory Gaussian process, $X(n) = Y(n) + \mu$, and $G(\cdot)$ is a function with Hermite rank $k \geq 2$. Although Theorem 2.14 says that $G(\cdot + x)$ has Hermite rank 1 for small x, the following is a natural question: if one estimates μ by $\bar{X}_N$ and considers the centering $X_N(n) := X(n) - \bar{X}_N$, can one recover an Hermite process of order k as limit for suitably normalized sum of $G(X_N(n))$? The expression (48) and the convergence (51) provides a negative answer with $G(x) = x^2$.

We now suppose that $\{X(n)\}$ is perturbed by a nonlinear transform in the spirit of Claim 2.12, which leads to consider the case where both $X(n)$ and $[X(n) - \mu]^2$ have Hermite rank 1. Then in view of Theorem 2.6 with $k = 1$, we write

$$U_N - \sigma^2 = N^{H-1} \frac{1}{N^H} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left((X(n) - \mu)^2 - \sigma^2 \right),$$

and in view of Theorem 2.6 with $k = 1$, we write

$$V_N = N^{2H-2} \left(\frac{1}{N^H} \sum_{n=1}^{N} [X(n) - \mu] \right)^2.$$

Since $H < 1$, we have $2H - 2 < H - 1$, and thus only the term U_N contributes to the limit. Then $N^{1-H}(\widehat{\sigma}_N^2 - \sigma^2)$ has the same limit as

$$N^{1-H}(U_N - \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{n^H} \sum_{n=1}^{N} [(X(n) - \mu)^2 - \sigma^2],$$

namely, $c_H Z_{H,1}(1)$ for some $c_H > 0$, where $Z_{H,1}$ is the fractional Brownian motion. Hence

$$N^{1-H} \left(\widehat{\sigma}_N^2 - \sigma^2 \right) \xrightarrow{d} c_H Z_{H,1}(1) \tag{52}$$

Remark 5.2. Under the above perturbation consideration, there is no dichotomy between $H < 3/4$ and $H > 3/4$ in (52), and the normalization is always N^{1-H}, which is of smaller order than both $N^{1/2}$ and N^{2H-2}. In the case $H < 3/4$, however, we get a Gaussian limit with or without perturbation. Hence without the perturbation consideration, there is the danger of underestimating the fluctuation magnitude of the sample variance, namely, taking the fluctuation to be of the order $N^{-1/2}$ when $H < 3/4$ and N^{2H-2} when $H > 3/4$, whereas they are of the order N^{H-1}. We also mention that similar considerations also apply to the study of the asymptotic behavior of sample autocovariance (see, e.g., Hosking [47], Wu et al. [79] and Lévy-Leduc et al. [55]).

5.2 Empirical processes

Empirical processes play important roles in many statistical problems. We refer the reader to Dehling et al. [27] for an introduction to empirical processes of dependent data. Let $\{X(n)\}$ be a stationary process with marginal cdf $F(x)$. The corresponding centered empirical process is defined as

$$F_N(x) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} \left[I\{X_n \le x\} - F(x) \right]. \tag{53}$$

When $\{X(n)\}$ is i.i.d., it is well-known that $N^{1/2}F_N(x)$ converges weakly in $D(-\infty,\infty)$ to $B(F(x))$, where $B(\cdot)$ is a Brownian bridge. Under some weak dependence conditions on $\{X(n)\}$, the process $N^{1/2}F_N(x)$ converges weakly in $D(-\infty,\infty)$ to a centered Gaussian process $G(x)$ with covariance structure given by

$$\mathbb{E}G(x)G(y) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cov}[I(X_0 \le x), I(X_n \le y)]. \tag{54}$$

See, e.g., Theorem 4.1 of Dehling and Philipp [24].

When $X(n)$ has long memory, the corresponding weak convergence results become rather different in nature. Indeed, assume that $X(n) = G(Y(n))$ where $\{Y(n)\}$ is a standardized stationary Gaussian process with Hurst index $1/2 < H < 1$. We define the deterministic function

$$J_m(x) = \frac{1}{m!}\mathbb{E}I\{G(Y(0)) \le x\}H_m(Y(0)),$$

where $H_m(\cdot)$ is the m-th order Hermite polynomial. Note that for any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $J_m(x)$'s are the coefficients of the Hermite expansion (5) of the function $\Delta_x(y) = I\{G(y) \le x\} - F(x)$. We have the following result:

Theorem 5.3 (Theorem 1.1 of Dehling and Taqqu [25])**.** *Let*

$$k = \inf\{m \ge 1 : \ J_m(x) \ne 0 \text{ for at least one } x \in \mathbb{R}\}, \tag{55}$$

and assume that $H > 1 - \frac{1}{2k}$*. Then we have the following weak convergence in* $D(-\infty,+\infty)$

$$N^{1-H_k}F_N(\cdot) \Rightarrow cJ_m(\cdot)Z_{H_k,k}(1) \tag{56}$$

where $Z_{H_k,k}(\cdot)$ *is the Hermite process as in (13), and* $H_k = (H-1)k+1$ *as in (11).*

Remark 5.4. It is interesting to note that in the long memory case, the limit process $\{J_m(x)Z_{H_k,k}(1),\ x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is quite degenerate, namely, it has correlation 1 between any different points $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, in contrast to the weak dependence case where the limit Gaussian process $G(x)$ admits rich correlation structure (see (54)).

By the perturbation argument, one may assume that the rank $k = 1$, regardless of the choice of $G(\cdot)$ in a statistical application of Theorem 5.3. In fact, the definition of rank (55) makes the assumption $k = 1$ even more appealing in this context, because $J_1(x) \ne 0$ for just one point x would make $k = 1$. From this point of view, the only practically relevant convergence in (56) is

$$N^{1-H}F_N(\cdot) \Rightarrow cZJ_m(\cdot), \tag{57}$$

where Z is a standard Gaussian variable, and thus the fluctuation of the empirical process is practically always of the order N^{H-1}. The convergence (56) can be applied to study the asymptotic behavior of U-statistics and V-statistics (see Corollary 1 of Dehling and Taqqu [25]). It is also applied to develop the asymptotic theories of estimation of the probability density function $f = F'$ (see Csörgö and Mielniczuk [22] and Section 6).

6 Statistical studies

In this section, we briefly review some statistical studies for long memory data involving the noncentral limit theorems. Assume throughout that $\{X(n)\}$ is a stationary *long memory* process, typically specified by a Gaussian process, or a linear process, or a nonlinear transform of either (we call the model a Gaussian or linear subordination).

In the kernel smoother type nonparametric estimation procedures, a nonlinear transform of the data is naturally involved. For example, the kernel density estimator of the probability density function $f(x)$ is defined as

$$\widehat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{Nh} \sum_{i=1}^{N} K\left(\frac{x - X(n)}{h}\right), \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{58}$$

where N is the sample size, $h > 0$ is the bandwidth parameter, and $K(\cdot)$ is a kernel satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}} K(x)dx = 1$. A number of studies have considered the asymptotic behavior of the estimator $\widehat{f}(x)$ as $N \to \infty$ and $h \to 0$. See, for example, Cheng and Robinson [17], Csörgö and Mielniczuk [22] and Ho [44],Wu and Mielniczuk [78]. Another typical class of statistical procedures involving kernel smoothers are the nonparametric local regressions (e.g., Nadaraya-Watson estimator and local polynomial estimators). Some relevant work involving noncentral limit theorems are Hidalgo [43] , Csörgö and Mielniczuk [23], Masry and Mielniczuk [58], Guo and Koul [40].

We mention that under long memory, the asymptotic behavior of kernel smoothers can be quite different from the short-memory case. In particular, an interesting dichotomy phenomenon appears in the asymptotics depending on how fast the bandwidth b_n tends to 0 with respect to the Hurst index H of $X(n)$. If b_n tends to 0 relatively slowly, one can have a very degenerate behavior such as the kernel density estimate $\widehat{f}(x)$ at different points of x becomes asymptotically perfectly correlated. See, e.g, Csörgö [21] as well as Chapter 5.14 of Beran et al. [13]).

Asymptotic results involving non-central limit theorems obtained when studying these kernel smoother procedures are due more often to the assumption that $X(n)$ is a nonlinear transform of a Gaussian or linear process, than due to the nonlinear transform produced by the kernel smoothing. To obtain a noncentral limit for $\widehat{f}(x)$ when $X(n)$ is Gaussian or linear, one has to be in very special framework, e.g., when focusing on the asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{f}(x)$ in (58) at a fixed point $x = x_0$ while assuming that the true density satisfies $f'(x_0) = 0$ (see, e.g., Theorem 3 of Wu and Mielniczuk [78]). Similar considerations extend to other nonparametric procedures, e.g, the spline regression under long memory noise (Beran and Weiershäuser [12]).

Wavelets are a useful tools for analyzing long-memory data due to their natural adaptivity to scaling. Noncentral limit theorems are involved in, e.g., Clausel et al. [19] and Clausel et al. [20], who studied the asymptotic behaviors of the wavelet coefficients and the wavelet estimation of Hurst index of the Gaussian subordination data.

Some other statistical studies involving noncentral limit theorems are: bivariate U-processes (Lévy-Leduc et al. [54]), change-point test (Zhao et al. [81], Dehling et al. [28]), goodness-of-fit test in regression Koul and Stute [52], normality test (Beran and Ghosh [11]), sign test (Psaradakis [64]), unit root test (Wu [77]) and Whittle quasi-maximum likelihood estimator (Giraitis and Taqqu [36]).

7 Conclusion and suggestions

In this paper, we discussed the instability of Hermite rank and other related ranks appearing in non-central limit theorems under long memory. We argued that a rank greater than 1 can be disturbed by a transform and only the first rank is stable. We provided empirical evidence supporting this argument. Such an instability feature has important important statistical implications. In particular, assuming a higher-order rank when it is really not there may result in underestimating the order of fluctuation of the statistic of interest.

To address the issue of instability of ranks, we briefly indicate here some suggestions for performing valid inference.

As illustrated, particularly in Section 5.1, one may adapt adopt the assumption that the rank is always 1, regardless of any nonlinear transform resulting from the statistical procedure. Some studies have implicitly done so, although without giving an explanation (see, e.g., Beran [10] and Shao [69]).

Another appealing way out, is to redesign the statistical procedure in a way as to avoid using non-central limit theorems for inference directly. This may be achieved by combining re-sampling method (see, e.g, Hall et al. [41], Nordman and Lahiri [59], Zhang et al. [80]), Bai and Taqqu [8]), together with suitable self-normalization technique (see, e.g., Shao [68] and Shao [69]). We refer the reader to Jach et al. [50] Betken and Wendler [14] and Bai et al. [9] for approaches of this type.

Acknowledgment. This work was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1309009 at Boston University.

References

[1] M.A. Arcones. Limit theorems for nonlinear functionals of a stationary Gaussian sequence of vectors. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 2242–2274, 1994.

[2] F. Avram and M.S. Taqqu. Noncentral limit theorems and Appell polynomials. *The Annals of Probability*, 15(2):767–775, 1987.

[3] S. Bai and M.S. Taqqu. Multivariate limit theorems in the context of longrange dependence. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 34(6):717–743, 2013.

[4] S. Bai and M.S. Taqqu. Generalized Hermite processes, discrete chaos and limit theorems. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 124(4):1710–1739, 2014.

[5] S. Bai and M.S. Taqqu. Convergence of long-memory discrete k-th order Volterra processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 125(5):2026–2053, 2015.

[6] S. Bai and M.S. Taqqu. The impact of diagonals of polynomial forms on limit theorems with long memory. *arXiv:1403.7544. To appear in Bernoulli*, 2015.

[7] S. Bai and M.S. Taqqu. Hermite rank, power rank and the generalized Weierstrass transform. *Preprint*, 2016.

[8] S. Bai and M.S. Taqqu. On the validity of resampling methods under long memory. *Preprint, arXiv:1512.00819*, 2016.

[9] Shuyang Bai, Murad S Taqqu, and Ting Zhang. A unified approach to self-normalized block sampling. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 126(8):2465–2493, 2016.

[10] J. Beran. M estimators of location for Gaussian and related processes with slowly decaying serial correlations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 86(415):704–708, 1991.

[11] J. Beran and S. Ghosh. Slowly decaying correlations, testing normality, nuisance parameters. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 86(415):785–791, 1991.

[12] J. Beran and A. Weiershäuser. On spline regression under Gaussian subordination with long memory. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 102(2):315–335, 2011.

[13] J. Beran, Y. Feng, S. Ghosh, and R. Kulik. *Long-Memory Processes: Probabilistic Properties and Statistical Methods*. Springer, 2013.

[14] A. Betken and M. Wendler. Subsampling for general statistics under long range dependence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.05720*, 2015.

[15] N.H. Bingham, C.M. Goldie, and J.L. Teugels. *Regular Variation*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 1989.

[16] P. Breuer and P. Major. Central limit theorems for non-linear functionals of Gaussian fields. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 13(3):425–441, 1983.

[17] B. Cheng and P.M. Robinson. Density estimation in strongly dependent non-linear time series. *Statistica Sinica*, 1(2):335–359, 1991.

[18] T. Cheng and H. Ho. On Berry–Esseen bounds for non-instantaneous filters of linear processes. *Bernoulli*, 14(2):301–321, 2008.

[19] M. Clausel, F. Roueff, M.S. Taqqu, and C. Tudor. Large scale behavior of wavelet coefficients of non-linear subordinated processes with long memory. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 32 (2):223–241, 2012.

[20] M. Clausel, F. Roueff, M.S. Taqqu, and C. Tudor. Wavelet estimation of the long memory parameter for hermite polynomial of Gaussian processes. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 18:42–76, 2014.

[21] S. Csörgö. The smoothing dichotomy in nonparametric regression under long-memory errors. *Statistica neerlandica*, 56(2):132–142, 2002.

[22] S. Csörgö and J. Mielniczuk. Density estimation under long-range dependence. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 990–999, 1995.

[23] S. Csörgö and J. Mielniczuk. Random-design regression under long-range dependent errors. *Bernoulli*, pages 209–224, 1999.

[24] H. Dehling and W. Philipp. Empirical process techniques for dependent data. In *Empirical process techniques for dependent data*, pages 3–113. Springer, 2002.

[25] H. Dehling and M.S. Taqqu. The empirical process of some long-range dependent sequences with an application to u-statistics. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1767–1783, 1989.

[26] H. Dehling and M.S. Taqqu. Bivariate symmetric statistics of long-range dependent observations. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 28(2):153–165, 1991.

[27] H. Dehling, T. Mikosch, and M. (editors) Sorensen. *Empirical process techniques for dependent data*. Springer, 2002.

[28] H. Dehling, A. Rooch, and M.S. Taqqu. Non-parametric change-point tests for long-range dependent data. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 40(1):153–173, 2013.

[29] M.V.S. Denaranjo. Non-central limit theorems for non-linear functionals of k Gaussian fields. *Journal of multivariate analysis*, 44(2):227–255, 1993.

[30] R.L. Dobrushin. Gaussian and their subordinated self-similar random generalized fields. *The Annals of Probability*, 7(1):1–28, 1979.

[31] R.L. Dobrushin and P. Major. Non-central limit theorems for non-linear functional of Gaussian fields. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 50(1):27–52, 1979.

[32] P. Doukhan. Models, inequalities, and limit theorems for stationary sequences. In *Theory and Applications of Long-Range Dependence*, pages 43–100. Birkhäuser, 2003.

[33] P. Doukhan and S. Louhichi. A new weak dependence condition and applications to moment inequalities. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 84(2):313–342, 1999.

[34] P. Embrechts and M. Maejima. *Selfsimilar Processes*. Princeton University Press, 2002.

[35] G. Faÿ, E. Moulines, F. Roueff, and M.S. Taqqu. Estimators of long-memory: Fourier versus wavelets. *Journal of econometrics*, 151(2):159–177, 2009.

[36] L. Giraitis and M.S. Taqqu. Whittle estimator for finite-variance non-Gaussian time series with long memory. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 178–203, 1999.

[37] L. Giraitis, R. Leipus, P.M. Robinson, and D. Surgailis. LARCH, leverage, and long memory. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 2(2):177–210, 2004.

[38] L. Giraitis, H.L. Koul, and D. Surgailis. *Large Sample Inference for Long Memory Processes*. World Scientific Publishing Company Incorporated, 2012.

[39] C.W.J. Granger and R. Joyeux. An introduction to long-memory time series models and fractional differencing. *Journal of time series analysis*, 1(1):15–29, 1980.

[40] H. Guo and H.L. Koul. Nonparametric regression with heteroscedastic long memory errors. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 137(2):379–404, 2007.

[41] P. Hall, B-Y Jing, and S.N. Lahiri. On the sampling window method for long-range dependent data. *Statistica Sinica*, 8(4):1189–1204, 1998.

[42] N. Herrndorf. A functional central limit theorem for weakly dependent sequences of random variables. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 141–153, 1984.

[43] J. Hidalgo. Non-parametric estimation with strongly dependent multivariate time series. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 18(2):95–122, 1997.

[44] H. Ho. On central and non-central limit theorems in density estimation for sequences of long-range dependence. *Stochastic processes and their Applications*, 63(2):153–174, 1996.

[45] H. Ho and T. Hsing. Limit theorems for functionals of moving averages. *The Annals of Probability*, 25 (4):1636–1669, 1997.

[46] H Ho and T. Sun. A central limit theorem for non-instantaneous filters of a stationary Gaussian process. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 22(1):144–155, 1987.

[47] J.R.M. Hosking. Asymptotic distributions of the sample mean, autocovariances, and autocorrelations of long-memory time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, 73(1):261–284, 1996.

[48] I.A. Ibragimov. Some limit theorems for stationary processes. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 7(4):349–382, 1962.

[49] K. Itô. Multiple Wiener integral. *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan*, 3(1):157–169, 1951.

[50] A. Jach, T. McElroy, and D.N. Politis. Subsampling inference for the mean of heavy-tailed long-memory time series. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 33(1):96–111, 2012.

[51] S. Janson. *Gaussian Hilbert Spaces*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[52] H.L. Koul and W. Stute. Regression model fitting with long memory errors. *Journal of statistical planning and inference*, 71(1):35–56, 1998.

[53] C. Lévy-Leduc and M.S. Taqqu. Long-range dependence and the rank of decompositions. *Fractal Geometry and Dynamical Systems in Pure and Applied Mathematics II: Fractals in Applied Mathematics*, 601:289, 2013.

[54] C. Lévy-Leduc, H. Boistard, E. Moulines, M.S. Taqqu, and V.A. Reisen. Asymptotic properties of U-processes under long-range dependence. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(3):1399–1426, 2011.

[55] C Lévy-Leduc, H. Boistard, E. Moulines, and Reisen V.A. Taqqu, M.S. Robust estimation of the scale and of the autocovariance function of Gaussian short and long-range dependent processes. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 32:135–156, 2011.

[56] P. Major. *Multiple Wiener-Itô Integrals: With Applications to Limit Theorems*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer, 2 edition, 2014.

[57] B.B. Mandelbrot and J.R. Wallis. Some long-run properties of geophysical records. *Water resources research*, 5(2):321–340, 1969.

[58] E. Masry and J. Mielniczuk. Local linear regression estimation for time series with long-range dependence. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 82(2):173–193, 1999.

[59] D.J. Nordman and S.N. Lahiri. Validity of the sampling window method for long-range dependent linear processes. *Econometric Theory*, 21(06):1087–1111, 2005.

[60] I. Nourdin and G. Peccati. *Normal Approximations With Malliavin Calculus: From Stein's Method to Universality*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

[61] J.D. Pelletier and D.L. Turcotte. Long-range persistence in climatological and hydrological time series: analysis, modeling and application to drought hazard assessment. *Journal of Hydrology*, 203(1):198–208, 1997.

[62] V. Pipiras and M.S. Taqqu. Regularization and integral representations of Hermite processes. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 80(23):2014–2023, 2010.

[63] V. Pipiras and M.S. Taqqu. *Long-Range Dependence and Self-Similarity*. Cambridge University Press, 2017. To appear.

[64] Z. Psaradakis. On inference based on the one-sample sign statistic for long-range dependent data. *Computational Statistics*, 25(2):329–340, 2010.

[65] M. Rosenblatt. A central limit theorem and a strong mixing condition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 42(1):43, 1956.

[66] M. Rosenblatt. Independence and dependence. In *Proc. Fourth Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Probab*, volume 2, pages 431–443, 1961.

[67] F.H. Schweingruber. *Tree rings and environment: dendroecology*. Paul Haupt AG Bern, 1996.

[68] X. Shao. A self-normalized approach to confidence interval construction in time series. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 72(3):343–366, 2010.

[69] X. Shao. A simple test of changes in mean in the possible presence of long-range dependence. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 32(6):598–606, 2011.

[70] D. Surgailis. Zones of attraction of self-similar multiple integrals. *Lithuanian Mathematical Journal*, 22 (3):327–340, 1982.

[71] D. Surgailis. Long-range dependence and Appell rank. *Annals of Probability*, pages 478–497, 2000.

[72] M.S. Taqqu. Weak convergence to fractional Brownian motion and to the Rosenblatt process. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 31(4):287–302, 1975.

[73] M.S. Taqqu. Convergence of integrated processes of arbitrary Hermite rank. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 50(1):53–83, 1979.

[74] M.S. Taqqu, V. Teverovsky, and W. Willinger. Estimators for long-range dependence: an empirical study. *Fractals*, 3(04):785–798, 1995.

[75] W.B. Wu. Central limit theorems for functionals of linear processes and their applications. *Statistica Sinica*, 12(2):635–650, 2002.

[76] W.B. Wu. Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102(40):14150–14154, 2005.

[77] W.B. Wu. Unit root testing for functionals of linear processes. *Econometric Theory*, 22(01):1–14, 2006.

[78] W.B. Wu and J. Mielniczuk. Kernel density estimation for linear processes. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1441–1459, 2002.

[79] W.B. Wu, Y. Huang, and W. Zheng. Covariances estimation for long-memory processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 42(1):137–157, 2010.

[80] T. Zhang, H-C Ho, M. Wendler, and W.B. Wu. Block sampling under strong dependence. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 123(6):2323–2339, 2013.

[81] W. Zhao, Z. Tian, and Z. Xia. Ratio test for variance change point in linear process with long memory. *Statistical Papers*, 51(2):397–407, 2010.

Shuyang Bai
Department of Statistics
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30606
bsy9142@uga.edu

Murad S. Taqqu
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Boston University
Boston, MA 02215
murad@bu.edu